

**No. 48110-3-II**

---

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF  
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DIVISION II**

---

**ARTHUR WEST,  
appellant,**

**Vs.**

**PORT OF TACOMA,  
respondent**

---

Review of decisions entered by  
the Honorable Judge Jerry Costello

---

**APPELLANT'S  
RESPONSE BRIEF**

---

Arthur West  
120 State Ave. NE # 1497  
Olympia, Washington, 98501

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Contents.....2

Table of Authorities.....3-6

Argument.....7-27

**I.** Retroactive and universal application of the non operative provisions of Hobbs to the differing circumstances of this case would lead to strained, absurd and manifestly inequitable results...7

**II.** The Port's redacted “restatement” misrepresents the allegations in the complaint and completely fails to address the rulings in Hikel and Cedar Grove or RCW 42.56.550(2), the express provision of law that allows for a cause of action for failure to produce a reasonable estimate, especially when the estimate is, as it was in this case, that the records would be produced “shortly”.....16

**III.** The Port's redacted “restatement” completely fails to address both RCW 42.56.550(2) and West's reasonable reliance upon Violante, West v. DNR, Double H v. Department of Ecology, Hangartner, as well as the orders of remand from the Appellate Courts and a judgment of the Superior Court that held that there was jurisdiction over this case.....20

**IV.** The Port's restatement completely fails to address that the port is barred by collateral estoppel from denying the jurisdiction of the trial court based upon the Courts' rulings and the judgment it obtained for \$1500 based upon the jurisdiction of the trial court in this case.....24

**V. CONCLUSION**.....27

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Am. Civil Liberties Union of Washington v. City of Seattle, 121 Wn. App. 544, 554, 89 P.3d 295 (2004).....	20
Bank v. Butler, 88 Wn.2d 777, 567 P.2d 631 (1977).....	27
Breier v. Northern California Bowling Proprietors' Ass'n, 316 F.2d 787, 790 (9th Cir.1963).....	23
Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Sav. Co. v. Hill, 281 U.S. 673, 678.....	1
California Dep't of Corrections v. Morales, 514 US 499 (1995).....	12
Carrick v. Locke, 125 Wn.2d 129, 882 P.2d 173 (1994).....	21
Cause No 09-2-14216-1, (Port of Tacoma II).....	18
Cascade Sec. Bank v. Butler, 88 Wn.2d 777, 567 P.2d 631 (1977).....	18
Cerrillo v. Esparza, 158 Wn.2d 194,201,142 P.3d 155 (2006).....	25
D'Amico v. Conguista, 24 Wash.2d 674, 167 P.2d 157 (1946).....	39
Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 182, 83 S.Ct. 227, 9 L.Ed.2d 222 (1962).....	42
Friends of Columbia Gorge, Inc. v. WA Forest Practices Appeals Bd., 129 Wn. App. 35, 47-48, 118 P.3d 354 (2005).....	26
Haines v, Anaconda Aluminum Co., 87 Wn.2d 28, 549 P.2d 13 (1976).....	27
Haywood v. Aranda, 143 Wn.2d 231, (2001).....	30

Hearst Corp. v. Hoppe, 90 Wn.2d 123, 139, 580 P.2d 246 (1978).....	45
Hobbs v. State Auditor's Office, 183 Wn. App. 925 (2014) .....	10, 25-7, 32-36, 39-42
In re Marriage of Parks, 48 Wn. App. 166, 170, 737 P.2d 1316 (1987).....	31
Livingston v. Livingston, 43 Wn. App. 669, 672, 719 P.2d 166 (1986).....	31-2
Neighborhood Alliance of Spokane County v. County of Spokane, 172 Wn.2d 702, 727, 261 P.3d 119 (2011).....	45
Noble Manor v. Pierce County, 133 Wn.2d 269, 289, 943 P.2d 1378 (1997).....	41
Noll v. Carlson, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987).....	43
PAWS v. U.W, 125 Wn.2d at 271.....	47
Peterson v. Hagan, 56 Wn.2d 48, 53, 351 P.2d 127 (1960).....	39
Rains v. State, 100 Wn.2d 660, 664, 674 P.2d 165 (1983).....	31
Romjue v. Fairchild, 60 Wn. App. 278, 281, 803 P.2d 57, review denied, 116 Wn.2d 1026, 812 P.2d 102 (1991)).....	29
Servais v. Port of Bellingham, 127 Wn.2d 820, 833, 904 P.2d 1124 (1995).....	48
Spokane Police Guild v. Washington State Liquor Control Bd., 112 Wn.2d 30, 33-34, 769 P.2d 283 (1989).....	49-50

Spokane Research & Defense Fund v. City of Spokane, 155 Wn.2d 89, 103-04, 117 P.3d 1117 (2005).....	46
State ex rel. Johnson v. Funkhouser, 52 Wn.2d 370, 325 P.2d 297 (1958).....	39
State ex rel, State Finance Commission v. Martin, 62 Wn.2d 645, 384 P.2d 833, (1963).....	27
State ex rel. Heyes v. Superior Court, 12 Wn.2d 430, 433, 121 P.2d 960 (1942).....	22
State ex rel. Humiston v. Meyers, 61 Wn.2d 772, 777, 380 P.2d 735 (1963).....	22
State v. Halgren, 137 Wn.2d 340, 346 n. 3, 971 P.2d 512 (1999).....	40-41
State v. Jones, 168 Wn.2d 713, 722, 230 P.3d 576 (2010).....	25
State v. Potter, 68 Wn.App. 134, 150, 842 P.2d 481 (1992).....	41
State v. Stewart, 125 Wn.2d 893, at 900, (Wash. 1995).....	41
Violante v. King County Fire Dist. No. 20 571, 114 Wn. App. 565, (1979).....	27, 46-7
Waremart v. Progressive Campaigns, 139 Wash.2d 623, 647-48, 989 P.2d 524 (1999).....	39
West v. Department of Natural Resources, 163 Wn. App. 235 (Div. II, August 23, 2011).....	27
West v. Port of Olympia, 146 Wn. App. At 116-118, (2007).....	48
Whatcom County v. City of Bellingham, 128 Wash.2d 537, 546, 909 P.2d 1303 (1996).....	25
Windust v. Department of Labor & Industries, 52 Wn.2d 33, 323 P. 2d 241, (1958).....	24

**STATUTES**

RCW 42.56.550(2).....7, 10-11, 23, 33-5 39-42

**ARTICLES**

Prospective or Retroactive Operations  
of Overruling Decision, Annot.,  
10 A.L.R.3d 1371, 1386 (1964).....27

21 C.J.S. Courts §§ 181, 186, pp. 289, 297  
Goodhart, ‘Determining the Ratio Decidendi  
of a Case,’ Jurisprudence in Action, p. 191. ....38

A Computational Model of Ratio Decidendi,  
Karl Branting, University of Wyoming.....36

Black’s Law Dictionary (8th ed. 2004).....38-9

**CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

U.S. Constitutional Art 1, § 9.....7, 42

U.S. Constitutional Art. 1 § 10.....7, 43

The 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment.....42

Separation of Powers (Implied Doctrine).....7

Washington Constitution, Article IV Section 10.....52

## ARGUMENT

I. Retroactive and universal application of the non-operative provisions of Hobbs to the differing circumstances of this case would lead to strained, absurd and manifestly inequitable results

As Karl Llewellyn, one of the foremost proponents of american legal realism observed...

One does not progress far into legal life without learning that there is no single right and accurate way of reading one case, or of reading a bunch of cases<sup>1</sup>.

In this case we are presented with the question of what is the “right and accurate” way of harmonizing the terms of a recent decision of this Court in Hobbs with several decades of prior practice that appellant reasonably relied upon and how Hobbs might apply retroactively to the circumstances of this case where the port was not engaged in producing records, had issued an estimate consisting solely of the term “shortly” and where records eventually disclosed demonstrated that far from diligently and thoroughly complying with the PRA, the port's primary concern was consumed

---

<sup>1</sup> *Remarks on the Theory of Appellate Decisions and the Ruled or Canons about how Statutes are to be Construed*, 1950 Vanderbilt Law Review , v. 3, p. 395, Karl N. Llewellyn See also Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., *The Path of the Law*, 10 Harvard Law Review 457 (1897) “The fallacy to which I refer is the notion that the only force at work in the development of the law is logic.”...“Behind the logical form lies a judgment as to the relative worth and importance of competing legislative grounds, often an inarticulate and unconscious judgment, it is true, and yet the very root and nerve of the whole proceeding.”

with “diligently and thoroughly” attempting to evade the terms of the PRA and conceal records for political purposes to advance a controversial project without disclosing adverse impacts and undesirable consequences to concerned citizens.

Certainly, counsel for the port has their view of how this question might be resolved, but it is by no means the only possible “right and accurate” means of resolving the uncertainty of retroactive application of whatever portions of Hobbs are ultimately determined to be of binding precedential value.

Unlike counsel, appellant believes that, as a remedial statute enacted by the people to insure that agencies like the port of Tacoma actually produce records, the PRA should be liberally interpreted to effectuate the intent of the People and these goals, and that an across the board retroactive application of Hobbs would be manifestly contrary to this remedial intent.

Further, even if the alleged “new rule” in Hobbs is seen to have ratio decidendi effect, retroactive application of such a radical departure from previous practice that appellant and the Courts have reasonably relied upon would seriously implicate the type of concerns expressed by the Supreme Court in *Lynce*...

The presumption against the retroactive application of new laws is an essential thread in the mantle of protection that the law affords the individual citizen. That presumption “is deeply rooted in our jurisprudence, and embodies a legal doctrine centuries older than our Republic.” *Landgraf v. USI Film Products*, 511 U.S. 244, 265, 114 S.Ct. 1483, 1497, 128 L.Ed.2d 229 (1994). This doctrine finds expression in several provisions of our Constitution. *The specific prohibition on ex post facto laws is only one aspect of the broader constitutional protection against arbitrary changes in the law. In both the civil and the criminal context, the Constitution places limits on the sovereign's ability to use its lawmaking power to modify bargains it has made with its subjects.* The basic principle is one that protects not only the rich and the powerful, *United States v. Winstar Corp.*, 518 U.S. 839, 116 S.Ct. 2432, 135 L.Ed.2d 964 (1996), but also the indigent... *Lynce v. Mathis*, 519 U.S. 433 (1997) See also *Doe v. Gregoire*, 960 F.Supp. 1478, Western District of Washington (1997) (emphasis added)

It should come as no surprise that the port, in its standard tactic of the best defense is an outrageous offense, again attempts to subvert these protections on the part of its “rich and... powerful” clients and economically browbeat the appellant by seeking money from him for having the temerity to challenge what is very likely just the latest in a series of unlawful dismissals obtained by Ms. Lake. In 2014 Ms. Lake lost 4 appeals in a row and she had shamelessly asked for sanctions in each of those too, regardless of the fact that the requests were, as they are in this 5<sup>th</sup> case, completely meritless.

In the present case, while counsel can perhaps, make a barely arguable case that Hobbs justifies dismissal, the principles of Hobbs have simply not yet been applied to specific fact circumstance where an agency has provided cause for a plaintiff to challenge its estimate for production in court, when there is a record of the agency deliberately evading disclosure, and when the agency has subsequently failed to cure its violations of the PRA prior to taking final action.

As Division I recently recognized in *Hikel v. City of Lynnwood*, in recognizing a cause of action under the PRA (as is alleged in this present case) for failure to provide a reasonable estimate, citing to *City of Lakewood v. Koenig*, 182 Wn.2d 87, 97, 343 P.3d 335 (2014), it would “contravene the PRA's purpose” to adopt an interpretation of the law that “forces requestors to resort to litigation, while allowing the agency to escape sanction of any kind.”

Yet that very type of inequitable and absurd result is exactly what the port is attempting to attain here. The port is attempting to assert that an agency can deliberately delay disclosure, based upon public relations considerations, fail to provide a specific estimate, instead informing appellant that records would be produced “shortly”, then belatedly produce records for in camera review, then drag its feet and obtain an improper dismissal based upon an abuse of judicial discretion, fight all the way up to the Supreme Court and lose, and then waste further immense

amounts of time and resources attempting to deny justice in the Superior Court for many months and with literally reams of paper pleadings before finally seeking and obtaining a dismissal based upon the ridiculous claim that the courts it has been litigating in for nearly a decade never had jurisdiction in the first place!

Meanwhile, during the geologic era through which the port has been actively evading the PRA and obstructing review the statute of limitations has passed and new dicta of uncertain application has arisen that appears to be contrary to RCW 42.56.550(2) and previous practice in each division of the Court of Appeals and te Supreme Court. to address the records it admits it improperly withheld to begin with.

In effect the port seeks to have this court reward it for suborning an improper dismissal based upon a judicial abuse of discretion by granting it a second improper dismissal based upon circumstances that did not exist and would not have been applicable had it not acted improperly in obtaining an improper dismissal in 2010. Since the only reason that the port is able to even argue Hobbs is a result of the port's misconduct in securing an abuse of judicial discretion, such relief should be barred under the clean hands doctrine. See *Everett v. Williams*, (1725), 2 Pothier on Obligations 3.

Such an inequitable and absurd result as the port seeks would seriously subvert and undermine the intent of the people in enacting the

Public Disclosure Act and would be contrary to the established principle that The language of a statute should be construed to carry out, rather than defeat, the statute's purpose. *See Miller v. Paul Revere Life Ins. Co.*, 81 Wn.2d 302, 310, 501 P.2d 1063 (1972).

As the Supreme Court has repeatedly held... We construe statutes to effect their purpose and avoid unlikely or absurd results. *Thompson v. Hanson*, 167 Wn.2d 414, 426, 168 Wn.2d 738, 219 P.3d 659, 664 (2009) (rejecting party's interpretation of the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, chapter 19.40 RCW, because it would lead to strained results). See also *City of Seattle v. Dep't of Labor Indus.*, 136 Wn.2d 693, 698, 965 P.2d 619 (1998), *State v. Neher*, 112 Wn.2d 347, 351, 771 P.2d 330 (1989).

To apply Hobbs retroactively to bar relief when the port was not diligently producing records, but instead was admittedly (See CP 149, 150, 151, 152, and CP 149-185, generally) concealing records in a deliberate strategy to evade the PRA, and when, unlike the circumstances in Hobbs, the port had taken final action to improperly withhold records and those records had been delivered into the custody of the Court for in camera review would not only be inequitable and strained, it would implicate the interests identified in both *Lynce* and *Gregoire*: the “broader constitutional protection

against arbitrary changes in the law” which is applicable “(i)n both the civil and the criminal context”.

For this court to conclude that now, after nearly a decade of litigation and 3 appellate actions, that there never was any jurisdiction to begin with, that the port should get off scot free for an undeniable pattern of deliberate suppression of public records and admitted violations of the PRA and that plaintiff should be sanctioned<sup>2</sup> for pursuing a case that this very court ordered remanded would be a strained, patently absurd and inequitable result.

Even if plaintiff's arguments may be less than compelling in some minor respects, this court should let him off with the penalty of time served<sup>3</sup> over the last decade in attempting to secure review of the records that when recently disclosed demonstrated a deliberate campaign to suppress information) and responding to similar meritless requests by counsel, rather than subjecting him to

---

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps this court will not agree with the appellant's arguments, but there can be no reasonable dispute that arguing that the trial court had jurisdiction over the claims that this very court remanded back to it for adjudication and which are completely consistent with established practice appellant (and the appellate courts) reasonably relied upon is a good faith argument for the extension or modification (if not the only reasonable non-absurd interpretation) of existing public records law as it may have been altered by Hobbs.

<sup>3</sup> There were three thousand six hundred and fifty-three days like that in his stretch. From the first clang of the rail to the last clang of the rail. Three thousand six hundred and fifty-three days. The three extra days were for leap years

further travails and imposts for his efforts in attempting to comply with the order of Remand issued by this very Court.

Not only did the Port, by its own admissions, deliberately conceal information from the public and destroy records, it issued a series of public apologies, one published in the Tacoma News Tribune (CP 363-64), a second to the Port of Olympia<sup>4</sup> (CP 361), a third to the Port of Tacoma Employees (CP 362), and a fourth to the Friends of Rocky Prairie (CP 359), for (among other things) “withholding information from the public and otherwise undermining trust in our public process.”

These statements are inconsistent with the port's denials, and equitably estopp the port from alleging it complied with the PRA. In light of this undisputed record, this Court should find that the trial court had jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter.

---

<sup>4</sup> ... (T)his project has attracted attention... It was through this increased scrutiny one of the many public records requests we have received related to this project-- that we discovered unprofessional behavior among some of our staff members working on this project. The... documents we gathered to meet the records request included e-mails that fell within the following categories of inappropriate behavior. Taking procedural shortcuts, *withholding information from the public* and otherwise undermining trust in our public process. Inappropriate comments about communities, partners, colleagues and consultants...

II. The Port's "restatement" misrepresents the allegations in the complaint and completely fails to address the rulings in Hikel and Cedar Grove or RCW 42.56.550(2), the express provision of law that allows for a cause of action for failure to produce a reasonable estimate, especially when the estimate is, as it was in this case, that the records would be produced "shortly"

Perhaps the most critical omission from the port's (predictably pathological) "restatement" is that it deliberately edits and misstates the allegations in the Complaint and omits the fact that one of the port's allegedly "reasonable" estimates was "shortly". In contrast to the port's "redacted" version of the facts that omits critical allegations and circumstances, plaintiff alleged a failure to promptly provide a reasonable estimate for disclosure in response to the port's less than diligent productions and the estimate that the records would be available "shortly".

Section 3.2 of the Complaint, which the port predictably omits from their redacted "restatement", explicitly states

...Defendants have refused to comply with the disclosure act entirely, and refused to respond promptly with a date certain for disclosure.  
(emphasis added)

Further, since the record is clear that one of the Port's estimates lacked any greater definition than "**shortly**", this case clearly falls within the scope of the recent ruling of Division I in

Hikel v. City of Lynnwood which found grounds for jurisdiction when a plaintiff argues an agency has failed to provide a reasonable estimate. As the Court in Hikel held...

“The plain language of the PRA provides that costs and reasonable attorney fees shall be awarded to a requester for vindicating ‘the right to receive a response.’ City of Lakewood v. Koenig, 182 Wn.2d 87, 97, 343 P.3d 335 (2014) (quoting RCW 42.56.550(4))

**In Hobbs, the court held that a requester could not recover any penalty or fees for PRA violations if the agency cured the violation before taking final action to deny the requested records.** Hobbs, 183 Wn. App. At 940-41.(emphasis added)

We disapprove of this view to the extent that it denies fees for procedural violations. The Supreme Court has observed that an interpretation where the only remedy for the State's insufficient withholding index was to compel an explanation of the exemptions . would contravene the PRA's purpose because an agency would have “no incentive to explain its exemptions at the outset” and “[t]his forces requestors to resort to litigation, while allowing the agency to escape sanction of any kind.”Koenig, 182 Wn.2d at 97-98 (second alteration in original) (quoting Sanders, 169 Wn.2d at 847)

The same principle applies here: if the only remedy for failing to provide a reasonable estimate is to treat the violation as an aggravating factor in calculating a penalty, where the agency does not withhold the records, and is therefore subject to no penalty, it has no incentive to provide a reasonable estimate. For these reasons, we conclude that the legislature intended always to provide for an award of fees and costs when an agency fails to comply

with RCW 42.56.520.

This Court should agree with Division I in Hikel that a cause of action exists under RCW 42.56.550 section (2) as well as section (1) and that the ratio decidendi of Hobbs is limited to the holding that **a requester can not recover any penalty or fees for PRA violations if the agency cures the violation before taking final action to deny the requested records.** (emphasis added)

Similarly, the decision in the Cedar Grove case does not support the port's position either in that the CedarvGrove Court held...

At oral argument, Marysville cited a recent case from Division Two of this court, Hobbs v. Washington State Auditor's Office, for the rule that an agency's denial of records is a "necessary predicate" of a cause of action under RCW 42.56.550. Thus, Cedar Grove had no cause of action as to the 15 records. But the facts in Hobbs differ... Hobbs filed suit immediately after the agency produced its first installment,... He complained mainly about redactions, all of which the superior court later found to comply with the PRA. Division Two affirmed the dismissal of Hobbs's case:

When an agency diligently makes every reasonable effort to comply with a requester's public records request, and the agency has fully remedied any alleged violation of the PRA at the time the

requester has a cause of action (i.e., when the agency has taken final action and denied the requested records), there is no violation entitling the requester to penalties or fees.

More significantly, and fatal to the port's case in the present circumstances is that the Cedar Grove Court held...

Here, although the process the City's public records officer used complied with the PRA, the record as a whole does not show that the City responded with "reasonable thoroughness and diligence to public records requests." Rather, the record demonstrates that certain members of city government and Strategies intentionally withheld responsive records and pursued a policy of evading the requirements of the PRA. The PRA makes clear that it is not up to an agency to decide which records are consequential or inconsequential. And Marysville's position ignores the fact that a court assesses penalties on the basis of what documents the government withheld, not what it produced. Cedar Grove Composting v. City of Marysville, 188. Wn. App. 695, 354 P.3d 249 (Div. 1 2015)

As in Cedar Grove, in this present case “the record as a whole does not show that the “Port” responded with "reasonable thoroughness and diligence to public records requests." and this Court should rule in a manner consistent with Division I in Cedar Grove, the case the port itself cites as controlling.

**III.** The Port's redacted restatement completely fails to address both RCW 42.56.550(2) and West's reasonable reliance upon *Violante*, *West v. DNR*, *Double H v. Department of Ecology*, *Hangartner*, an orders of remand from this Court and a judgment of the Superior Court that held that there was jurisdiction over this case.

The port also neglects, in its zeal to assert a knee-jerk request for fees to even attempt to address the appellant's arguments as to reasonable reliance, *stare decisis*, *ex post facto* laws or estoppel. Even should *Hobbs* be seen to radically alter the Public Records Law in the manner claimed by counsel, the circumstances of this case where appellants rights to review vested under the previously accepted rules of practice, where the records were produced for in camera review and reviewed, and when both the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court found there to be jurisdiction sufficient to justify an order of remand back to the Superior Court.

Significantly, *in State ex rel. Washington State Finance Committee v. Martin*, 62 Wn.2d 645, 384 P.2d 833 (1963) the court held:

If rights have vested under a faulty rule, or a constitution misinterpreted, or a statute misconstrued, or where, as here, subsequent events demonstrate a ruling to be in error, prospective overruling becomes a logical and integral part of *stare decisis* by enabling the courts to right a wrong without doing more injustice than is sought to be corrected. . . . The courts can act to do that which

ought to be done, free from the fear that the law itself is being undone.

In the present case, it is apparent that prior to Hobbs all three divisions of the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court have found jurisdiction for suits brought under the PRA for suits brought prior to an agency completing its response under the PRA, as did both Divisions I and II implicitly in remanding this and a companion case, and as such reasonable reliance was justified.

In *West v. Department of Natural Resources* this Court found jurisdiction under the PRA even when the DNR had not completed its response. Similarly, in *Double H, LP v. Dep't of Ecology*, 166 Wash.App. 707, 271 P.3d 322, (2012) review denied, 174 Wash.2d 1014, (2012) Division III of the Court of Appeals also found jurisdiction even when the agency had not completed its response. In *Hangartner v. City of Seattle*, 151 Wn.2d 439, both the court of Appeals and Supreme Court found jurisdiction even when the agency had not completed its response until 2 days after the suit was filed. In *Violante v. King County*, Division I found that..."A plaintiff is a prevailing party if "prosecution of the action could reasonably be regarded as necessary to obtain the information," and "the existence of the lawsuit had a causative effect on the release of

the information.” *Coalition on Gov't Spying v. Dept. of Public Safety*, 59 Wn. App. 856, 863, 801 P.2d 1009 (1990) (quoting *Miller v. United States Dep't of State*, 779 F.2d 1378, 1389 (8th Cir. 1985)) also found that if the existence of a lawsuit was objectively reasonable or had a causal effect on disclosure that a requestor was entitled to penalties and fees. According to the courts' jaundiced view, all of this precedent was somehow overturned sub silencio, by the dicta in *Hobbs*.

Yet the existence of all of this precedent and the reasonable reliance upon it by both plaintiff and the Courts for the many decades the PRA has been interpreted in this manner, militate strongly against a retroactive repeal of this precedent in a manner that unfairly burdens a citizen such as the appellant in cases where jurisdiction has previously been found to exist.

In a case over a century old that is relevant today in light of recent executive Orders..in *Chew Heong v. United States*, 112 U. S. 536 (1884), the Supreme Court considered

a provision of the "Chinese Restriction Act" of 1882 barring Chinese laborers from reentering the United States without a certificate prepared when they exited this country. We held that the statute did not bar the reentry of a laborer who had left the United

States before the certification requirement was promulgated. Justice Harlan's opinion for the Court observed that the law in effect before the 1882 enactment had accorded laborers a right to reenter without a certificate, and invoked the "uniformly" accepted rule against "giv[ing] to statutes a retrospective operation, whereby rights previously vested are injuriously affected, unless compelled to do so by language so clear and positive as to leave no room to doubt that such was the intention of the legislature." *Id.*, at 559.

As the Supreme Court recognized in *Bouie*, albeit in a criminal context...

The Due Process Clause compels this same result here, where the State has sought to achieve precisely the same effect by judicial construction of the statute. While such a construction is of course valid for the future, it may not be applied retroactively...*Bouie v. city of Columbia* *Bouie v. City of Columbia*, 378 U.S. 347 (1964)

This Court should similarly reject a retroactive application of *Hobbs* that alters decades of accepted legal practice to the detriment of the appellant.

**IV** The Port's restatement completely fails to address that the port is barred by collateral estoppel from denying the jurisdiction of the trial court based upon the Courts' rulings and the judgment it obtained for \$1500 based upon the jurisdiction of the trial court in this case.

The Port, as always, no matter how unwarranted the request is, seeks sanctions and fees for the alleged lack of jurisdiction of the trial court. Yet, in addition to the circumstance that the port, appellant, and 3 appellate courts recognized the jurisdiction of the trial court in this case, there are 1500 very good reasons why this is a frivolous argument, in that the port has already obtained \$1500 on the basis that the trial court in this case did have jurisdiction.

The Trial Court erred in entering the Orders of November 20 and December 15 ( CP at 432 and 463, respectively) when this Court's Order in the Opinion of February 20, 2014, (In the previous appeal) expressly held that the port was not producing records at the time the suit was filed; and recognized West's claims under RCW 42.56.550(2)...

( ... **“(T)he port repeatedly pushed back its expected release date.** On January 14, 2008, West filed a complaint alleging that the Port's Actions violated the Public Records Act.” (See Opinion of February 20, 2014, emphasis added)

Similarly, when counsel moved for dismissal of “duplicative” claims in Cause No 09-2-14216-1, Division I of the Court of Appeals explained in its April 20, 2014 ruling in 71366-3 in the companion Port of

Tacoma II case...

On July 26, 2010, the trial court heard the Port's motion to dismiss West's claims, alleging they were duplicative of claims made in a previous lawsuit. The trial court granted the Port's motion as to one of the claims and sanctioned West in the amount of \$1500, payable to the Port.

This ruling that Division I of the Court of Appeals discusses was based upon the jurisdiction of the court in this present case.

The alleged untimely payment of these terms were then employed by counsel as a means to secure yet another wrongful and unlawful dismissal of PRA claims from the Honorable Judge Edwards in Port of Tacoma II. (As in this present case, the previous dismissal in Port of Tacoma II was reversed.)

Significantly, the Port's Response in support of its Motion to dismiss of July 23, 2010 demonstrates that the Port obtained a dismissal of “duplicative” claims in that case based upon an express representation that this court had jurisdiction over West's PRA claims.

As Counsel Lake wrote in that pleading in Port of Tacoma II...

“However, despite his personal disagreement, Mr West cannot bypass **the jurisdiction** and judgments of the original litigation by inventing a new cause of action<sup>5</sup>....”  
(**emphasis in original**)

---

<sup>5</sup> See Port's Motion to dismiss of July 23, 2010, in Cause No. 09-2-14216-1, and the Order of August 23, 2010 awarding the Port affirmative relief in the form of terms of \$1,500 as a result of the finding that this Court had previous jurisdiction over the PRA claims, (in this case).

Stare Decisis is defined as...

"Literally, to stand by decided matters; . . . as implying the doctrine or policy of following rules or principles laid down in previous judicial decisions unless they contravene the ordinary principles of justice. This principle had an important part in the development of the English common law." *Windust v. Department of Labor & Industries*, 52 Wn.2d 33, 323 P. 2d 241, (1958)

It was reversible error for the Trial Court to refuse to recognize the stare decisis and res judicata effects of the express language and holding of the Court of Appeals in remanding this case for further proceedings.

All of this brings us back to Oliver Wendell Holmes' most important and influential "realist" argument, the "bad-man" theory of law:

"[I]f we take the view of our friend the bad man we shall find that he does not care two straws" about either the morality or the logic of the law. For the bad man, "legal duty" signifies only "a prophecy that if he does certain things he will be subjected to disagreeable consequences by way of imprisonment or compulsory payment".

Like Holmes' theoretical "bad man" it is apparent that the Port of Tacoma cares nothing for ethics, morality, compliance with the PRA or legal theorizing and concerns itself only with practical consequences of how it can evade the requirement of disclosure and

escape scott free from any for of responsibility or accountability for evident and admitted violations of the law.

Appellant hopes that the Court is “realistic” enough to agree that the fundamental intent of the PRA is to require disclosure of the records of the people's business and the PRA's remedial penalty provisions must be construed liberally to hold even the “bad agency” such as the Port of Tacoma accountable in the only manner that such a malefactor concerns itself with.

## **V. CONCLUSION**

The circumstances in this case differ from those in Hobbs in a number of significant respects: The Port was not in the process of producing records at the time of suit, West asserted a claim for failure to provide a reasonable estimate of a date certain, after the Port repeatedly failed to meet its self-imposed deadlines, and most importantly, perhaps, the defects in the Port's response were not cured by any final disclosure prior to a hearing in the Superior Court, as evidenced by the exemption logs on file in this case.

Even in the unlikely event that Hobbs or the Honorable Judge Costello could re-write RCW 42.56.550(2) to eliminate a cause of action

for failure to provide a reasonable estimate, it is undeniable that this Court, Division I, the Supreme Court, the Port, West, and the Honorable Judge Edwards in Cause No. 09-2-14216-1 (CP 443-461) reasonably relied upon the jurisdiction of this case in taking many, many, affirmative acts over the course of the last 9 years.

It would be the height of inequity to allow admitted violations of law to escape any form of justice and to send this ponderous mass of litigation tumbling back down to the infernal depths of Tartarus after so much reasonable reliance has been placed upon the merits of this case to be heard at trial, merits, it must be mentioned, are no longer subject to dispute by the “bad actors” at the Port due to their internal memos and recent disclosures

Respectfully submitted this 15th day of February, 2017.

s/Arthur West  
ARTHUR WEST

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on 15th day of February, 2017, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the preceding document on the party listed below at their Tacoma Hilltop offices via:

Via Email

**Attorneys for Respondent Port of Tacoma**

Carolyn Lake  
Goodstein Law Group, PLLC  
501 South G Street  
Tacoma, WA 98405

*s/Arthur West*  
ARTHUR WEST

**CUSHMAN LAW OFFICES PS**

**February 15, 2017 - 4:54 PM**

**Transmittal Letter**

Document Uploaded: 1-481103-Appellant's Brief.pdf

Case Name: West v. Port of Tacoma

Court of Appeals Case Number: 48110-3

**Is this a Personal Restraint Petition?** Yes  No

**The document being Filed is:**

Designation of Clerk's Papers Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers

Statement of Arrangements

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_

Answer/Reply to Motion: \_\_\_\_\_

Brief: Appellant's

Statement of Additional Authorities

Cost Bill

Objection to Cost Bill

Affidavit

Letter

Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes: \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)

Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Petition for Review (PRV)

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

No Comments were entered.

Sender Name: Doreen Milward - Email: [dmilward@cushmanlaw.com](mailto:dmilward@cushmanlaw.com)